

2001 DRAFTING REQUEST**Senate Amendment (SA-SB55)**Received: **05/17/2001**Received By: **traderc**Wanted: **Soon**

Identical to LRB:

For: **Legislative Fiscal Bureau**By/Representing: **Schug**This file may be shown to any legislator: **NO**Drafter: **traderc**

May Contact:

Addl. Drafters:

Subject: **Environment - water quality**

Extra Copies:

Submit via email: **NO**

Requester's email:

Pre Topic:

LFB:.....Schug -

Topic:

Nonpoint source program, south fork of Hay River

Instructions:

See Attached

Drafting History:

<u>Vers.</u>	<u>Drafted</u>	<u>Reviewed</u>	<u>Typed</u>	<u>Proofed</u>	<u>Submitted</u>	<u>Jacketed</u>	<u>Required</u>
/?	traderc 05/20/2001	wjackson 05/21/2001		_____			
/1			jfrantze 05/22/2001	_____	lrb_docadmin 05/22/2001		

FE Sent For:

2001 DRAFTING REQUEST**Senate Amendment (SA-SB55)**Received: **05/17/2001**Received By: **traderc**Wanted: **Soon**

Identical to LRB:

For: **Legislative Fiscal Bureau**By/Representing: **Schug**This file may be shown to any legislator: **NO**Drafter: **traderc**

May Contact:

Addl. Drafters:

Subject: **Environment - water quality**

Extra Copies:

Submit via email: **NO**

Requester's email:

Pre Topic:

LFB:.....Schug -

Topic:

Nonpoint source program, south fork of Hay River

Instructions:

See Attached

Drafting History:

<u>Vers.</u>	<u>Drafted</u>	<u>Reviewed</u>	<u>Typed</u>	<u>Proofed</u>	<u>Submitted</u>	<u>Jacketed</u>	<u>Required</u>
1?	traderc	1 wlj 5/21	25/21	26/199 3/22			

FE Sent For:

<END>

Tradewell, Becky

From: Schug, David
Sent: Thursday, May 17, 2001 2:59 PM
To: Tradewell, Becky
Subject: DATCP Finance Motions

Becky,

Please draft the following changes to the bill from Tuesday's executive session:

Paper #205 Info tech-- Alt. B2 (maintain annual appropriation)
Paper #207 -- Alt A3 (annual approps)
Include Motion # 623 on Drainage Districts
Include Motion # 619 on IPM in Schools
Include Motion # 625 on Treated Lumber

In addition, please draft the following changes to the bill from Wednesday's executive session:

Include Motion # 296 on Nonpoint Funding
Include Motion # 301 on South Fork of Hay River

I'll fax over copies of the motions momentarily.

David

David Schug
Legislative Fiscal Bureau
Phone: (608) 266-3847
Fax: (608) 267-6873
David.Schug@legis.state.wi.us

Representative Huber
Senator Welch

NATURAL RESOURCES AND AGRICULTURE, TRADE AND CONSUMER PROTECTION

South Fork of the Hay River

Motion:

Move to extend the statutorily designated South Fork of the Hay River priority watershed sunset date from June 30, 2001 to June 30, 2006 in order to provide additional cost-share grants to landowners in the watershed. Further, require DATCP to provide funding to counties for staffing in the South Fork of the Hay River priority watershed in the same manner as other continuing priority watersheds receive staffing funds.

Note:

The South Fork of the Hay River priority watershed area (in Barron, Dunn, Polk and St. Croix Counties) was statutorily designated a priority watershed until June 30, 2001, in the 1997 biennial budget act. The South Fork watershed area is exempt from nonpoint requirements related to cost-share rates and the types of best management projects installed. Instead, cost-shares are paid based on the amount of pollution reduced. Dunn County, with assistance from DNR, established guidelines for this pilot project related to cost-share rates and types of practices to be installed. At the completion of the project, DNR will evaluate the cost-effectiveness and the nonpoint source water pollution reduction associated with this pilot project. The watershed was originally designated priority in 1993. Extending this pilot project would use some revenues that would otherwise be available from DNR's competitive nonpoint grant program. The pilot project was allotted \$180,600 for landowner cost-share grants in 2000 and \$175,500 to the counties for staffing grants.

MO# 301
Burke
Decker
McCore
Silbilski
Plache
Witch
Daring
Welch
Gard
Kaufert
Albers
Duff
Ward
Huebsch
Huber
Cogg

15:1

Tradewell, Becky

From: Schug, David
Sent: Saturday, May 19, 2001 5:39 PM
To: Tradewell, Becky
Subject: RE: South Fork of Hay River

I believe in order to trump motion #296, which discusses different matching grants for priority watershed projects for grants prior to the determination date that was in effect **on Oct 6, 1998**, an exemption needs to be made for the Hay Creek Watershed since the funding termination date in effect as of 1998 would have been June 30, 2001.

-----Original Message-----

From: Tradewell, Becky
Sent: Saturday, May 19, 2001 1:35 PM
To: Schug, David
Subject: South Fork of Hay River

David,

On Motion #301, I'm not sure what needs to be done about the second sentence. Is there a problem with DATCP providing funding or a reason that they would not provide funding in the same manner as other priority watersheds?

Thanks,
Becky

2001

Date (time)
needed

SOON

LRB b 0298 11

**LFB BUDGET AMENDMENT
[ONLY FOR LFB]**

PUT : WLJ :

See form **AMENDMENTS — COMPONENTS & ITEMS.**

**LFB AMENDMENT
TO 2001 ASSEMBLY BILL 144 AND 2001 SENATE BILL 55**

>>FOR JT. FIN. SUB. — NOT FOR INTRODUCTION<<

At the locations indicated, amend the bill as follows:

#. Page , line :

#. Page , line :

#. Page , line :

#. Page , line :

#. Page , line :

#. Page , line :

Page 1450, line 25: after that line insert!

3176m

Section 281.65 (11) of the statutes is amended to read:

281.65 (11) Notwithstanding subs. (3) (am) and (3m), the South Fork of the Hay River is a priority watershed for the period ending on June 30, 2001²⁰⁰⁶. Notwithstanding subs. (2) (a), (4) (dm), (c), (em) and (g) 4., (4m) (b) 3. and (8) (b) and (e), the department, in consultation with the local units of government involved with the priority watershed project, shall establish guidelines for the types of non-point source water pollution abatement practices to be eligible for cost-sharing grants in the watershed. Notwithstanding sub. (8) (f), the amount of a cost-sharing grant in the watershed may be based on the amount of pollution reduction achieved rather than on the cost of the practices installed, using guidelines developed by the department, in consultation with the local units of government involved with the priority watershed project. The department and the local governmental staff involved with the priority watershed project shall evaluate the cost effectiveness of the project and the reduction in nonpoint source water pollution associated with the project.

History: 1977 c. 418; 1979 c. 34, 221; 1979 c. 355 s. 241; 1981 c. 20; 1981 c. 346 s. 38; 1983 a. 27; 1983 a. 189 s. 329 (16); 1983 a. 416; 1985 a. 29; 1987 a. 27; 1989 a. 31, 336, 366; 1991 a. 39, 309; 1993 a. 16, 166, 213, 246, 491; 1995 a. 27, 201, 225; 1995 a. 227 s. 428; Stats. 1995 s. 281.65; 1995 a. 404 s. 204; 1997 a. 27, 209, 237; 1999 a. 9; 1999 a. 150 s. 672.

***NOTE: The sentence added to s. 281.65(11) is needed because of LRB60297. If that draft is not used to make the JCF sub., the sentence must be deleted.

In providing funding under s. 92.14 (3), for staff for the priority watershed project, the department of agriculture, trade and consumer protection shall determine the amount of matching funds required for staff for the priority watershed project as though the funding termination date of June 30, 2006, had been in effect on October 6, 1998.

(End)

LFB:.....Schug – Nonpoint source program, south fork of Hay River

FOR 2001–03 BUDGET — NOT READY FOR INTRODUCTION

LFB AMENDMENT

TO 2001 SENATE BILL 55 AND 2001 ASSEMBLY BILL 144

1 At the locations indicated, amend the bill as follows:

2 **1.** Page 1450, line 25: after that line insert:

3 “**SECTION 3176m.** 281.65 (11) of the statutes is amended to read:

4 281.65 (11) Notwithstanding subs. (3) (am) and (3m), the South Fork of the Hay
5 River is a priority watershed for the period ending on June 30, ~~2001~~ 2006.
6 Notwithstanding subs. (2) (a), (4) (dm), (e), (em) and (g) 4., (4m) (b) 3. and (8) (b) and
7 (e), the department, in consultation with the local units of government involved with
8 the priority watershed project, shall establish guidelines for the types of nonpoint
9 source water pollution abatement practices to be eligible for cost-sharing grants in
10 the watershed. Notwithstanding sub. (8) (f), the amount of a cost-sharing grant in
11 the watershed may be based on the amount of pollution reduction achieved rather
12 than on the cost of the practices installed, using guidelines developed by the

1 department, in consultation with the local units of government involved with the
2 priority watershed project. In providing funding under s. 92.14 (3), the department
3 of agriculture, trade and consumer protection shall determine the amount of
4 matching funds required for staff for the priority watershed project as though the
5 funding termination date of June 30, 2006, had been in effect on October 6, 1998. The
6 department and the local governmental staff involved with the priority watershed
7 project shall evaluate the cost effectiveness of the project and the reduction in
8 nonpoint source water pollution associated with the project.”.

****NOTE: The sentence added to s. 281.65 (11) is needed because of LRBb0297. If
that draft is not used to make the JCF sub., the sentence must be deleted.

9 (END)